

REMARKS

Claims 7, 12 and 13 are presented for consideration, with Claim 7 being independent.

Claim 7 has been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art.

Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, on page 14, line 25, *et. seq.*, of the specification and in Figures 7 and 9.

The amendments to the claims were not presented earlier as it was believed that the previously presented claims would be found allowable. This Amendment does not add any additional claims. Moreover, the Examiner's familiarity with the subject matter of the present application will allow an appreciation of the significance of the amendments herein without undue expenditure of time and effort. Finally, the Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search. Accordingly, it is submitted that consideration and entry of the Amendment is appropriate.

Claims 7, 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Parce '358. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 of Applicant's invention relates to a detection method for detecting a plurality of different substances contained in a specimen using a label. The method comprises sequentially the steps of flowing the specimen through a detecting element having a first substance trapping portion immobilizing a first substance trapping body for specifically trapping a first substance contained in the specimen, a second substance trapping portion immobilizing a

second substance trapping body for specifically trapping a second substance contained in the specimen, with the second substance being different from the first substance, and a channel, and flowing a solution containing the label through the first substance trapping portion immobilizing the first substance trapping body and the second substance trapping body immobilizing the second substance trapping body.

Claim 7 also includes the steps of 1) flowing a solution for generating a signal from the label through the first substance trapping portion immobilizing the label such that a first layer of aqueous solution flow through the first substance trapping portion and a second layer of aqueous solution flow through the second substance trapping portion coexist while a third layer of alcoholic solution flow exists between the first layer of aqueous solution flow and the second layer of aqueous solution flow and that the solution for generating a signal from the label forms the first layer of aqueous solution flow, to thereby acquire a signal from the first substance trapping portion, and 2) flowing a solution for generating a signal from the label through the second substance trapping portion immobilizing the label such that a first layer of aqueous solution flow through the first substance trapping portion and a second layer of aqueous solution flow through the second substance trapping portion coexist while a third layer of alcoholic solution flow exists between the first layer of aqueous solution flow and the second layer of aqueous solution flow and that the solution for generating a signal from the label forms the second layer of aqueous solution flow, to thereby acquire a signal from the second substance trapping portion.

In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance detection method for detecting different substances contained in a specimen can be provided.

As discussed in the previous Amendment of January 3, 2008, Parce '358 relates to an assay system for monitoring transporter/transmitter activities in vitro. As shown in Figure 1, a transmitter 100 flows into a first channel, where it contacts cells or other components comprising transporter activity 104. A detectable signal is produced when the transmitter binds to the cell or other components which include receptors for the transmitter. The Office Action asserts that Parce provides various methods for trapping sample materials on probes in channels by flowing the samples through a channel, flowing a label through the channel to bind with samples cut by the probes, and then flowing another solution through the channel to release the bound components for detection. In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, however, Parce does not teach or suggest, among other features, providing a third layer of alcoholic solution flow between a first layer of aqueous solution flow and a second layer of aqueous solution flow in order to acquire signals from the first and second substance trapping portions. As discussed above, Parce uses on two layers of flow.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Parce fails to anticipate or render obvious Applicant's invention as set forth in Claim 7. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claim 7 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 12 and 13 set forth

additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vmm

FCIS_WS 2259664v1